2026-08-27 18:22:13 **You**

Matthew 22, “…when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city..."

In light of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and anachronism posed by linear events of the parable; provide a defensible argument that 'the burning of the city' is proleptic and allowed in parables.

Do not discuss the conjecture that it may be a later gloss because Luke does not mention it.

Perplexity gpt56_terra_thinking

Matthew 22:7 can be read defensibly as a **proleptic prophetic scene**: within the parable, the king’s destruction of “their city” anticipates Jerusalem’s destruction in A.D. 70, but the parable does not intend to furnish a linear timetable of salvation history. It narrates the judicial consequence of rejecting and murdering the king’s messengers before returning to its principal invitation-and-response motif.

The central claim

A concise formulation of the argument is:

> In Matthew 22:7, the destruction and burning of “their city” is a proleptic, parabolically compressed representation of God’s coming judgment on Jerusalem. It is not required to occur in the parable’s story sequence at the same chronological point at which every corresponding historical event occurred. A parable is a purpose-built figurative narrative, not a chronicle; its order is governed by theological and rhetorical logic.

This reading does **not** require saying that the verse is merely vague or symbolic. “Their city” may quite reasonably refer to Jerusalem, and “his armies” to the Roman forces by which God’s judgment was effected in 70. The point is that the parable represents those forces as the king’s armies in the familiar biblical sense of providential instruments of judgment. A traditional commentary identifies the troops as the Roman armies, calls Jerusalem “their city,” and expressly recognizes that the parable places the destruction before the subsequent invitation to the Gentiles even though Gentile proclamation had already occurred for about forty years. studylight

Why chronological compression is legitimate

The objection is straightforward: Matthew 22:7 places the city's destruction before the king tells his servants to gather people from the highways (vv. 8–10), whereas the gospel was being taken to Gentiles well before A.D. 70. But that observation establishes **non-linear representation**, not an error or an impossibility.

A parable is not historical narrative. It is a realistic but invented story crafted to demand a response and communicate a central theological claim; it may contain allegorical correspondences without requiring every narrative feature to map one-for-one onto a dated event. The parable's sequence is therefore primarily logical: cbs.mbts

1. The king graciously invites those who should have welcomed his son.
2. The invited persons refuse, dishonor, and murder his messengers.
3. Their rejection is shown to be culpable and judicially consequential.
4. Those previously excluded or not first invited are gathered in.
5. Even those admitted must respond appropriately to the king's provision.

The city-burning scene functions as the narrative's **verdict** on violent rejection. It answers, "What does rejection of the King's Son and his emissaries finally mean?" It does not answer, "On what exact date did every phase of the mission to Israel and the nations occur?"

Indeed, Matthew's own presentation makes a strict chronological allegory impossible. The church's mission beyond Israel plainly begins before Jerusalem's fall: the risen Jesus commands disciple-making among "all nations" in Matthew 28:19. Thus, if verses 8–10 include the broad gathering of outsiders, the parable itself requires a theological rather than a rigidly sequential correspondence. The ancient commentator's observation is exactly right: the parable puts destruction first, but the historical proclamation to Gentiles had already begun. studylight

Prolepsis, not historical displacement

"Prolepsis" means that a narrative brings a later event into view ahead of its historical occurrence in order to interpret present action in light of its end. That is what Matthew 22:7 does.

At the level of the **parable's story**, the king's response follows the murder of his servants: the order is intelligible as a royal reprisal. At the level of the **referential history**, however, the scene anticipates the outcome of the escalating rejection of Jesus and his representatives. The later destruction is narrated now because it reveals the gravity of the present rejection.

The point may be put this way:

Level	Sequence
Parable's p lot	Invitation → refusal and murder → royal judgment → broadened invitation

Level	Sequence
Salvation history	Jesus' ministry and rejection → apostolic witness to Israel and Gentiles → Jerusalem's destruction in A.D. 70 → continuing worldwide mission
Theological logic	Rejection of the Son and his envoys incurs judgment; God's purpose nevertheless gathers a people for the Son's feast

The parable has selected, telescoped, and arranged its material around the third line. It is therefore **prophetic panorama**, not documentary chronology.

This is common in biblical prophecy. Prophetic discourse regularly juxtaposes events separated in time because they belong to one theological pattern of warning, judgment, restoration, or kingdom fulfillment. The "prophetic perfect" is a related biblical phenomenon: prophets can portray future events as accomplished because their certainty under God's decree allows them to be viewed from the standpoint of fulfillment. One should not make an overly technical grammatical claim that Matthew 22:7 itself is a Hebrew prophetic perfect—the parable is Greek narrative and naturally tells its story in past-tense verbs—but the **prophetic mode of representation** is comparable: a future judgment is brought forward into the hearer's present as a settled warning. rsc.byu.edu jewsforjes...

The setting supports a prophecy of Jerusalem

The destruction scene is not an arbitrary interpolation into the plot. It belongs to the escalating conflict of Matthew 21–23.

Immediately before Matthew 22, Jesus tells the parable of the tenants (Matt. 21:33–46). There, the tenants beat, kill, and stone the owner's servants, then kill his son. The chief priests and Pharisees understand that Jesus is speaking about them (21:45). Matthew 22 develops the same pattern:

- Servants are sent.
- The invitees mistreat and kill them.
- The king judges those murderers.
- The invitation is extended more widely.

The parable's killing of servants therefore represents more than casual refusal. It evokes the long rejection of prophetic messengers and moves toward the rejection of the Son himself. Matthew then continues directly into Jesus' lament: "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. 23:38), followed by the prediction that not one stone of the temple will be left upon another (Matt. 24:2). In that literary setting, reading Matthew 22:7 as a forward-looking judgment on Jerusalem has substantial contextual support.

The language of the verse also fits Old Testament judgment imagery. God may describe a foreign imperial force as **his** instrument without thereby implying that its commanders knowingly serve him. Isaiah calls Assyria "the rod of mine anger" (Isa. 10:5), while Jeremiah calls Nebuchadnezzar "my servant" in the context of judgment on Jerusalem and Judah (Jer. 25:9; 27:6). A commentary on

Matthew 22:7 accordingly identifies the Roman armies as “the unconscious instruments of God’s wrath” and connects this usage with Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Joel. Thus “he sent forth his armies” is theological narration: the Roman armies were Rome’s at the political level, yet God’s instruments at the level of divine judgment. studylight

Parabolic freedom is broader than this one issue

The claim that a parable may contain prolepsis is not a special exception invented to solve Matthew 22:7. It follows from the way parables work.

Parables often use features that are not meant to be pressed as literal, ordinary, or chronologically exhaustive correspondences. Consider Matthew 18:23–35: a slave owes ten thousand talents, an extravagant and effectively unpayable sum; the narrative’s excess makes the king’s mercy, and the servant’s unforgiveness, unforgettable. One calculation places a talent at about fifteen years’ wages, so ten thousand talents is approximately 150,000 years’ wages. The story is not false because it is deliberately disproportionate; its disproportion serves its theological force. orthodoxy…

Likewise, the city-burning in Matthew 22:7 does not become illegitimate merely because it telescopes a later historical judgment into a tightly constructed story of rejection and replacement. The parable’s aim is not to tell hearers, “Only after A.D. 70 will the invitation reach outsiders.” Its aim is to declare, “The rejection of the King’s Son is neither harmless nor capable of defeating the King’s purpose.”

That reading also avoids an unhelpful alternative: treating the destruction as if it made God’s invitation depend on the annihilation of a people. The story’s immediate rhetorical contrast is between those who judged themselves unworthy of the banquet and the unexpected people gathered from the roads. The historical mission was never so tidy: Jewish believers were included, Gentiles were included before 70, and the gospel’s movement was already expanding. The parable dramatizes covenantal accountability and divine generosity; it does not erase every historical distinction among Jews, Jewish Christians, Gentiles, opponents, and believers.

A defensible conclusion

The best argument, then, is not that Matthew accidentally gets history out of order, nor that every parabolic detail must line up chronologically with a historical counterpart. Rather:

> Matthew 22:7 is a legitimate proleptic element in a prophetic parable. The parable narrates Jerusalem’s future judgment as the king’s settled answer to the rejection and murder of his messengers. Its order is rhetorical and theological—rejection, judgment, then the king’s successful gathering of guests—not a sequential outline of the church’s mission. The historical fact that Gentile evangelization preceded A.D. 70 confirms that the story is telescoped, but it does not undermine its reference to Jerusalem’s destruction.

On this reading, the burning of the city is both historically pointed and literarily appropriate: it is the future consequence brought into the narrative present so that Jesus’ hearers recognize the seriousness of their present response to the Son. Many interpreters identify verse 7 with the Roman

destruction of Jerusalem, while still recognizing that the parabolic character of the passage prevents the details from functioning as a strict historical chronology. biblehub kenolsons...

Sources from 30 sites

The Confrontation in Jerusalem: Matthew... spu.edu	The Parable of the Wedding Feast, Part 1... twojourneys.org	How Not to Read the Parables - For the Churc... ftc.co	What historical events might Matthew 22:7 allud... biblehub.com
A Call for Discernment: Interpreting the Parables cbs.mbts.edu	Matt 22.7 and the Date of Matthew's Gospel - Ken... kenolsonsblog.wordpress....	Interpreting the King's Banquet Parable in... stevethomason.net	Matthew 22 - Schaff's Popular Commentary on... studylight.org
Introduction to Jesus' Parables - the JesusWal... jesuswalk.com	Parable of the Wedding Feast - Reviving Creation revivingcreation.org	For those that believe everything in the Bible... reddit.com	The Wedding Feast | Reformed Bible Studies ... learn.ligonier.org
What is the meaning of the Parable of the Wedding... gotquestions.org	Commentary on Matthew 22:15-22 - Working... workingpreacher.org	Parables of Jesus | Encyclopedia.com encyclopedia.com	Matthew 22:7 - Verse-by-Verse Bible Commentary... studylight.org
New Oxford Annotated Bible Overview | PDF |... scribd.com	Luke 19 Commentary - Precept Austin preceptaustin.org	70 AD (Destruction of Jerusalem & Temple) |... matthew713.com	Matthew 22:7 (KJV) - Forerunner Commentary... bibletools.org
Question on when the Gospel was preached to... reddit.com	70 AD (Jewish War, Fall & Destruction of Jerusale... matthew713.com	What is the meaning of Matthew 22:7? - Bible Hub biblehub.com	天主教中英对照(新约)-圣经园地 books.ziliaozhan.win
Matthew Chapter 22 — Taylor Bible Study... taylorbiblestudy.com	Habakkuk 2:14 - Verse-by-Verse Bible Commentary... studylight.org	Barclay's Daily Study Bible studylight.org	Synoptikon: Streams of Tradition in Mark,... dokumen.pub
Matthew 22:8 (KJV) - Forerunner Commentary... bibletools.org	Less well-known Rapture verses. The case for the... christianchat.com		